

gather closer to be warmed by our flames of reassurance. But even more important than this, Madam President, by passing this bill we will be true to ourselves. A nation that refuses to face reality cannot long endure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] for his treatment of title V.

I was necessarily absent from the Chamber at the conclusion of the remarks which were made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], but what I heard of his remarks were delivered with force and clarity.

As members of the Judiciary Committee, both the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Pennsylvania know the history of the Civil Rights Commission and the legislation which has kept it in existence. Many of us who feel that the work of this Commission is important and that it should be made permanent—when I say permanent, obviously Congress can at any time bring it to an end either by the failure to appropriate funds or otherwise—believe it is extremely difficult to plan for the future when a commission has a limited tenure and is constantly subject to the harassments that have been attendant upon the efforts to renew the life of the Commission from time to time.

In all candor, we can say that today, were it not for the work of the Civil Rights Commission, the facts and figures which stand behind the affirmative case for the pending bill might not have been gathered. The careful groundwork which has preceded the preparation of the figures has been most helpful and has tended to set aside some of the myths of racial harmony and racial apathy which might otherwise not have been dispelled.

I agree completely with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Commission should be made a permanent agency. I commend both of these members of the Judiciary Committee who have so carefully and forcefully presented the case for title V.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I thank my distinguished friend from New York for his comments and extend to him my personal appreciation.

CIVIL RIGHTS RIFLE CLUBS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in Cleveland there has been a development within the last several days which causes great concern to public officials, including myself. Cleveland is my hometown. I have before me a copy of the Sunday issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 5. It carries an article under the headline "Rifle Club Forming Here 'To Protect' Rights Drive."

The story told in this newspaper is to the effect that Mr. Lewis G. Robinson,

35 years of age, and a World War II veteran, and former president of the Freedom Fighters, a militant civil rights group, said that in Cleveland rifle clubs are being formed in connection with the civil rights issue. Mr. Robinson said that one club has a cadre of 50 instructors, that the club is to be named after Medgar Evers, field director for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, who lost his life in Mississippi last June.

Mr. Lewis G. Robinson is quoted as having said:

Negroes must become prepared to protect themselves against any person who violates their civil liberties when the police department fails to do this.

He contends that a racial disturbance of last January at what is known as the Murry Hill School, the police of the city of Cleveland failed to give protection to the Negroes who were involved in that disorder.

That charge is vigorously disclaimed by the police and the public officials of Cleveland.

Mr. Robinson further went on to say that about 16 such rifle clubs already exist in the United States. Plans are being made to coordinate their activities. These plans will be discussed this summer.

He stated that there will be a coordination of these rifle clubs formed for the purpose of self-defense in the different cities of the Nation, especially one already allegedly in existence in Detroit.

It is said in this newspaper article that Malcolm X, the leader of the Black Nationalist group, and former spokesman for the Black Muslims, has given the movement for the creation of rifle clubs added impetus.

Mr. Robinson further stated:

We expect whites to be shocked by this because Negroes have been so passive in the past. We hope the American people will wake up. We want to let them know how serious the civil rights issue is.

Robinson said that members of the rifle clubs will wear Army fatigues, helmet liners, heavy boots, and use two-way radios.

He said:

Our training will be equivalent to Army basic training, and we are looking for sites in the country to practice on. Each member must purchase his own rifle within 6 months.

Mr. Robinson further stated that an organizational meeting will be held at 1402 East 120th Street in Cleveland.

There is one aspect of this that is rather solacing and encouraging. Mr. Harold B. Williams, who is a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has said:

I am not so sure that Mrs. Evers would like to have her husband's memory enshrined by these methods. I do not believe Medgar Evers would have used this technique for social change.

He said it was inevitable in the civil rights struggle that divergent groups such as Robinson's would crop up.

Mr. President, to me, this is a matter of the gravest character. Congress is trying to enact a program that will provide for every citizen the full enjoyment

of his constitutional rights, no more, no less. From my own standpoint, I have fought for the provision of constitutional rights for every minority group since the first day I entered public office. Men who are now speaking on this issue were silent when I was one of the vigorous proponents of the fact that our country cannot survive if the opportunity of having a full enjoyment of those rights written into the Declaration of Independence and into the Constitution of the United States by the forefathers and creators of this Nation is not given to every citizen.

I will not attempt to enumerate the fights which I made. I was the first Governor of Ohio to appoint a Negro judge. I was the first to appoint a second Negro judge. I was the first to assist vigorously in the appointment of a third Negro judge.

As mayor of Cleveland, I broke the barrier that prohibited and made it impossible for a Negro to become a fireman. The whites argued that they would not live in the same building with the Negroes. The Civil Service Commission did not have the audacity to challenge that claim. I ordered the Commission to give the Negro the appointment because he was at the top of the list.

As mayor, I broke the barrier in the electric light and water departments against hiring Negroes to occupy the position of watermeter readers. It was argued that white families would not permit Negroes to enter their houses to read the watermeters and the electric meters. I did not believe the argument was sound. I issued the order that the hirings should be made, and they were made.

I was primarily responsible for the hiring of numerous Negroes in the government-operated transportation system in Cleveland. If one goes to Cleveland now, he will see buses operated by Negro men and women bus operators.

During the war, from 1942 to 1944, while I was mayor, I went into plant after plant, arguing for the equal rights of the Negro to have work.

So when I speak on the subject, I do not do so with a background that is not favorable and friendly to the achievement of the ultimate position that there shall not be discrimination against anyone in our country.

The question arises: "How should I feel in the face of this claim by Mr. Robinson that rifle clubs are being organized in Cleveland and in my State?" What does it mean? It means that there are leaders who are advocating the use of deadly weapons in the solution of this problem, which if tranquility and reason would prevail, could be achieved completely devoid of that course.

I am firmly of the conviction that proposals of this type are harming the cause of the Negro. Moreover, I am firmly convinced that arguments made in the Senate, stating that violence will develop unless something is done are not in the interest of the security of our country.

Those who are proposing the wearing of fatigues and high boots and the carrying of guns do not understand the true

April 6

character and psychology of the people of our country. Does Robinson feel that if a gun is put on the people of the United States that they will be more likely to support his proposal? In effect that is what he is saying.

This matter is grave. It cannot be disregarded. Before I entered the Chamber, I pondered whether I should speak on the subject. The devil within me said "Keep silent. You will be hurt politically if you speak." The easiest course to follow would have been not to say anything. But that would have been a coward's course. Not more than 3 hours ago I spoke about the great courage and heroism of General MacArthur. Should I now, 3 hours later, fail to speak on this subject merely because it might harm me politically?

The time is at hand when we must speak the truth. We cannot hide our judgments and our thoughts solely because we feel we will be defeated at the polls at the next election.

I shall repeat the sentences I read from the newspaper:

Robinson said members will wear Army fatigues, helmet liners, heavy boots, and use two-way radios:

Each member must purchase his own rifle within 6 months.

I hope that our guests in the gallery hear what I am saying. This is a critical hour. I regret that there are not others present, whom I have heard speak in the Chamber about acting in fear. I will act, but it will not be in fear. It will be in furtherance of justice and decency.

If I were to act otherwise, it would be better to drop my head in shame and run for cover, so that the eyes of decency would not look upon me.

Mr. President, I regret that this has happened in my city. I hope that sereneminded citizens will not be provoked into what could be a natural consequence of this threat and challenge. I feel quite certain that that will not be their reaction, and that they will not allow these enemies of our Nation to begin to institute this type of policy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's yielding. First, I congratulate him upon his forthrightness and courage. No one has ever accused the Senator from Ohio of being devoid of the quality of courage. I never expect to hear anyone charge him with such delinquency.

Mr. President, I, too, regret that he has found this tendency toward violence and encouragement of strife in his good city of Cleveland.

I wonder whether he will permit me to request the printing at this point in the Record of an Associated Press dispatch from New York City. The dispatch shows that Malcolm X, formerly a Black Muslim, but who now characterizes himself a "rebel Black Muslim," was preaching the same sort of racial strife and racial hatred in the streets of Harlem, a few nights ago. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me to read that dispatch into the RECORD?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The article reads as follows:

VOTES OR SHOTS, NEGRO DECLARES

New York.—Malcolm X, rebel black Muslim leader, told 1,000 cheering Negroes Sunday night that "it's time for you and me to let the Government know it's ballots—or bullets."

Speaking at a Harlem rally, he added:

"No more turning the other cheek. No more give like that. There will be non-violence only with those who are not violent with us."

It was Malcolm's first public rally since he bolted March 8 from Elijah Muhammad's Nation of Islam to organize Negroes into a new civil rights movement emphasizing "self-defense."

His first effort, he said, will be a voter registration drive.

Negro voters, Malcolm asserted, have the "power to determine who will sit in the White House and who will sit in the doghouse."

I think the Senator from Ohio is so right in calling the attention of the Nation to this tendency, and in reminding those who are moving in that dangerous direction that just as they, the colored people, have shown themselves, on the field of battle and otherwise, to be not fearful and to have plenty of physical courage, so will the white people be found; and I remind them that the white people outnumber them 10 to 1. I would also remind them that vast numbers of us are trying to move—some, more hastily than others—toward solutions which will bring an end to this troubled time of sore trial for our Nation.

But surely it is not American or in the best interests of our country to preach violence and to threaten in the way that this man, who has been quoted by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, has, in effect, been threatening the peace and dignity of the great city of Cleveland.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for his important contributions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to say that I am sure the wire services will not publish anything I have said. I know that will be the result, even though I cannot possibly understand that there is no significance to the statements I have made. I ask them, do you hear what I said?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 118 Leg.]

Aiken	Humphrey	Mundt
Bartlett	Inouye	Muskie
Bayh	Javits	Nelson
Bible	Johnston	Neuberger
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Pastors
Burdick	Keating	Pearson
Cannon	Kennedy	Pell
Carlson	Kuchel	Proxmire
Case	Lausche	Ribicoff
Church	Long, Mo.	Saitoestall
Cotton	Manfield	Scott
Curtis	McClellan	Smith
Douglas	McGovern	Sparkman
Gruening	McIntyre	Symington
Hart	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Hickenlooper	Miller	Yarborough
Hill	Monrone	Young, Ohio
Holloman	Morse	
Hruska	Morton	

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me, without in any way prejudicing his rights to the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. Under such an agreement, I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wanted to announce, while many Senators are present in the Chamber, that following the address of the Senator from Florida there will be another quorum call and there will be further activity in the Senate this evening. That should be a fair warning to Senators. I hope Senators will respond to the next quorum call as quickly as they did to the one just had.

May I inquire of the Senator from Florida if he has any guidelines for us to indicate how long his address will take?

Mr. HOLLAND. In reply to my distinguished acting leader, it will take at least 2 hours. As to whether it will extend beyond that time, that will depend on whether any questions are addressed to me or whether any interruptions are made. I shall be happy to yield to any Senator who has legitimate business before the Senate, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Iowa without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask the Senator from Minnesota, the acting majority leader, if he can give us an indication as to what hour this evening he hopes the Senate may recess.

Mr. HUMPHREY. About 10 o'clock. In light of what the Senator from Florida has said, it is hoped to have a quorum call somewhere between 8 and 8:30 p.m.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Following the quorum call, there will be one or two speeches, but probably no further quorum calls after that.

Will the Senator from Florida yield further, without jeopardizing his right to the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield under the same arrangement.

AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE ON THE SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agreed to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] provided I did not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the sessions of the American Jewish Conference on the Soviet Jewry held Sunday and today at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., were participated in by

1964

leading members of 24 Jewish organizations throughout the United States, who protested the anti-Jewish activities of the Soviet Union.

My colleague from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] made an eloquent speech last night, as did Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court Arthur Goldberg.

I ask unanimous consent that three addresses, one by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], one by Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, and my own, together with sundry newspaper stories referring to the conference, and a newspaper report on the repudiation by the Ideological Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of a shameful and scandalous anti-Semitic publication in the Ukraine, under the auspices of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE SOVIET UNION (Address by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF)

We have just concluded our celebration of the joyous festival of Passover. Our celebration was incomplete, our joy marred, by our knowledge that for our fellow Jews in Russia this was not a happy holiday but a sad and deprived one. For weeks before the Passover, and every day during it, we were aware of the tragedy which the Soviet authorities have made of the observance of the holiday by Soviet Jews.

First, there was the ban, for the third year running, on the public baking and distribution of matzoh. Next, they ostensibly permit some communities to provide token amounts to their members, while pretending to the world that they have enough matzah. Then they officially encourage Jewish communities in the West to send in large shipments of matzoh—which would, however, still be grossly insufficient to the need. But as soon as the parcels arrive from abroad, Soviet customs offices hold up delivery until it is too late to be used for the holiday. And at the same time, the authorities initiate a vicious nationwide propaganda campaign labeling the dispatch of matzoh from abroad as “ideological sabotage” and “ideological subversion.”

This assault on Passover is not new. It is a recurring feature of all Soviet propaganda against the Jewish religion. It was recently brought to world attention in that beastly anti-Semitic volume, “Judaism Without Embellishment.”

Why this persistent and virulent assault on the Passover? The answer to this question brings us to the heart of the predicament of Soviet Jewry. For Passover uniquely represents Jewish historical continuity, Jewish consciousness, Jewish identity. And it is that continuity, that consciousness, that identity, which the Soviets are intent upon destroying.

Passover reminds Soviet Jews—even non-religious ones—of a glorious Jewish past and a living Jewish present. It reminds them of Jewish freedom, of Jewish unity, of the Jewish family, of Jewish kinship, of Jewish peoplehood past and present. These are precisely the values, ideas and sentiments which Soviet policy seeks to eradicate. Passover is the symbol of Jewish identity, and so it bears the brunt of the assault.

We Jews are expert in the history and meaning of persecution. The last chapter in that tragic role of ours cost the Jewish people one-third of its total number—victims of Nazi extermination. Now in the Soviet Union, 3 million Jews—one-quarter of our number, the second largest Jewish commu-

nity in the world—are subjected to a vicious policy of attrition that is crushing their spirit.

If I were to sum up the situation in three words, they would be—deprivation, discrimination, de-Judaization. These three words go to the heart of the problem of Jewish identity in the Soviet Union.

Jewish identity throughout history was always defined and molded by the interaction of the two facets of their group life—religion and peoplehood, by their consciousness of themselves as a religious people in history, by their shared memory of their historical continuity, by their awareness of being bound to each other—and to their past, present and future as a group—by the felt doctrines of covenant, revelation and law.

Many groups, subjected to oppression, have in the course of history succumbed to it and disappeared. The Jews have not been so obliging—because they found the inner resources to withstand external pressure. These resources the Jews found in their identity and in their consciousness of it.

What has kept the Jews vital and creative as a people has been their constant awareness of their identity, their historical consciousness of a special commitment to a millennial tradition of law, learning and justice, within the context of their religious faith.

I am not suggesting that we Jews are, or have ever been, a perfect people. The prophets and rabbis who have persistently castigated us throughout our history have attested to the contrary. But for all that, the Jews have been a God-intoxicated people, which is but another way of describing the Jewish commitment to law, learning, and justice.

It is that proud, passionate, historic commitment, which has made it possible for the Jewish people to maintain its identity and to perpetuate its vital tradition in the face of the most unlikely odds.

Now, the crux of Soviet policy is tragically simple. Its objective has been for at least a decade and a half the ultimate obliteration of the spirit of the Jewish people within the domain of the U.S.S.R.

That policy aims at destroying the wellsprings of vitality and creativity that have immemorially nourished the Jewish spirit. It intends to atomize the Soviet Jewish community, to estrange it from its past, to pulverize its Jewish identity, to stifle its awareness of that identity, to crush the Jewish historical consciousness of commitment to a millennial tradition of law and learning. In short, that policy aims at destroying and preventing every possibility of Jewish group survival in any form.

At the root of Soviet policy is the false assumption that the Jews are alien; that they are not indigenous; that they don't quite belong; that there is something peculiar about them. With that grounding in deep-seated, traditional, irrational prejudice, the meaning of real facts and events is falsely distorted out of all relation to reality and given a false meaning that has significance only in terms of that prejudice. Soviet reasoning then proceeds as follows:

Since masses of Soviet Jews, heir to the traditional Russian Jewish love of Zion, are eager to learn of life in Israel, their loyalties are falsely assumed to be in Tel Aviv and not in Moscow.

Since they wish to have contact with American Jews, there is falsely assumed to be something sinister going on between the CIA and the Jews of, say, Kiev.

Since the Jewish religious liturgy contains many passages of prayer for Jerusalem, Judaism is falsely assumed to be subversive.

Since so many Jews demonstrate their eagerness for Jewish cultural facilities and educational institutions, they are falsely assumed to be peculiar.

Since many Soviet Jews, lone remnants of families shattered by the Nazi holocaust,

wish to be reunited with their kin in Israel, the United States, or elsewhere, they are falsely assumed to be disloyal.

It all starts with that first false assumption; all the distorted conclusions follow from that.

As you may know, the Jews have a dual official status in the U.S.S.R.: they are both a nationality and a religious group. This very duality—which is the natural outgrowth of their traditional evolution—makes them a unique social entity there. And this very uniqueness causes suspicion. The very terms for his nationality and his religion are readily interchangeable—and in the social chemistry of Soviet life, these words for “Jew” and “Jewish” carry negative charges of suspicion and shame. Hostile words about the Jewish religion inevitably carry over negatively about the Jewish nationality—even for the nonreligious Jew.

The Soviet Union is ideologically committed and constitutionally organized to recognize the full right of every one of its 108 nationalities to perpetuate their identity and to maintain cultural institutions toward that end. Small wonder: Though 50 percent of the Soviet population is made up of the Great Russian nationality, the remaining 50 percent is composed of the 107 other nationalities, whose group needs and aspirations can hardly be denied.

The crucial importance of the concept of nationality in Soviet society cannot be over-emphasized. One's nationality is one of the two or three most decisive components of citizenship in the U.S.S.R. It largely determines the language one speaks, the literature and press one reads, the national history one identifies with, the customs one grows up with, the national heroes one cherishes.

One's nationality is thus of profound psychological, as well as cultural and political, significance. It might almost be said that nationality defines the man as well as the citizen—it molds his mind and heart and soul, gives him status, and provides him with a heritage of which he can be justly and publicly proud.

Now just imagine, in these terms, the real meaning of the Soviet Jewish tragedy. The Jews are very much a cultural-ethnic group—a nationality, in Soviet terms. They are officially recognized as such. And yet they are the only Soviet nationality deprived of all the rights and institutions by which they might live out their lives as a national-cultural group.

Try to imagine what this means to the Jew in the U.S.S.R. It means that the Jews are uniquely discriminated against—they know it and their non-Jewish neighbors know it. It means that the Jews have no opportunity to maintain and perpetuate their identity, their existence as a distinct group. It means that they are being forced to disappear. It means that, in their singular disability, they are deprived of their human pride, in Soviet terms, and are thus subjected to unique humiliation.

It has now been nearly a quarter of a century that no Jewish school has existed in which a Jewish child might learn something of Jewish language, literature, and history—a quarter of a century in which a whole generation of Jewish youth is confronted with a past that is a blank.

There is not a school, not a class, not a textbook, to fill that Jewish void. There is no institution through which the Jew can learn either Yiddish or Hebrew. There is no way for the Jew to perpetuate his heritage, for there is no way for him even to learn it.

True, the history, literature, and traditions of all Soviet nationalities are taught in a distorted and falsified way, judged by Communist canons of “progressive” and “reactionary.” But at least they are taught. At least the Uzbek and the Armenian and the Georgian and the Ukrainian and all the

April 6

others, can learn their language, can have something of their past to look to with pride.

The Jews are deprived even of the privilege of learning, for example, whether Maimonides or the Gaon of Vilna or Yehuda Halevi were "progressive" or "reactionary." Jewish history is nonhistory; Jewish culture, non-culture.

The psychological and spiritual destructiveness of this condition is shattering.

Add to this, now, the fact that the synagogues—the last remaining Jewish institution where Jews may still gather as Jews—are being subjected to a policy of forcible slow death. A process of attrition is gradually sapping the vitality of the whole of Jewish religion in the Soviet Union—for Judaism is the last residue, the final stronghold, of Jewishness in that land.

What conceivable danger is it to the Soviet Union if the Jews were to have enough matzoh, or prayer books, or Bibles, or phylacteries, or tallitot, or religious calendars?

What threat is it to the Soviet regime if synagogues remain open, or if Jews make a miyanot at home?

What incalculable harm can come to the country if Jewish infants are circumcised, or if the Jewish dead are buried according to the ancient Jewish rite?

The answer is obvious; it is all too tragically clear. There is no danger, no threat, no harm, to the Soviet state in all of these. But the regime recognizes that Judaism might still provide resistance to forcible Jewish disappearance, might still spark a revival of a sense of Jewishness and might still set Jewish hearts afire.

And so all these institutions are closed down; all these sacred rites and religious articles taken away.

And so the pathetic yeshiva in Moscow is left with two or three rabbinical students—while scores seek admission and hundreds would come if allowed.

And so congregations are allowed no official or formal contact with each other throughout the country, or with Jewish religious bodies abroad.

And so fright stalks the synagogues, in the form of informers and police agents.

And so synagogue Jews are intimidated and fear to have anything to do with a foreign Jew who comes to pray with them, to say shalom aleichem to them.

All these deprivations and discriminations this policy of de-Judaization, this whole pattern of forcible assimilation, are set against the background of a virulent press campaign in which the Jews are portrayed in the worst light.

On the one hand, the Jew is forbidden to learn anything positive about his history and heritage. On the other hand, he is confronted, in the daily press, in the special atheist journals and publications, and in university courses—with a massive propaganda assault which can only baffle, humiliate, and crush his spirit.

This propaganda teaches that the Bible is one of the most viciously reactionary and benighted books in the world—that the Jewish patriarchs were immoralists and plunderers—that the ancient Hebrews were nothing but slaveholders and imperialists—that the spirit of Judaism is commercial and exploitative—that money is the god of the Jewish religion—and that the Jews are "worshippers of the golden calf."

The Jew knows that, though Yiddish is considered the language of his nationality, he cannot learn it, and he has precious little to read in it. He knows that Hebrew is an unlanguage, proscribed as the language of both "clerical reaction" and "bourgeois Jewish nationalism." And he learns, from all the sources available to him, that the traditional and millennial Jewish religious

attachment to Zion and to the Holy Land, and his natural affection for Israel, is considered politically suspect, potentially or actually subversive.

And for the past 3 years, the daily press has dinned into the minds of the Soviet population and of the Jews the belief that the Jews play a sinister role in the country's economy. The traditional anti-Semitic doctrine that the Jews are money worshipers, consumed with greed and singlemindedly dedicated to the pursuit of the ruble, is constantly purveyed to the public.

This is done in no merely abstract way. It is tied to the massive nationwide campaign against economic crimes, such as embezzlement, bribery, corruption, and currency speculation, for which capital punishment was reinstated 3 years ago.

So far as we can tell from the Soviet press, 198 death sentences have been handed down in that period—of which at least 102, and probably more, were meted out to Jews.

Here, then, is the concrete way in which the Soviet regime reinforces the anti-Semitic stereotypes with which its press is full: Though the Jews constitute little more than 1 percent of the population, the country is led to believe that they are guilty of the kinds of economic crimes which warrant death—to the extent of 50 to 55 percent (and in the areas like the Ukraine, 80 to 90 percent).

Can you imagine how this vicious official incitation is greeted by large segments of the Soviet population in which anti-Semitic prejudices are still deep rooted and virulent? And can you imagine how all this affects the spirit of the Jews?

Why, even a young Soviet Jew—atheist, Communist, ignorant of and indifferent to Jewishness—will be agitated and insulted by the deprivations and discriminations, and by the public stereotyping of the Jews.

That young Jew will somehow also feel himself affected by the incessant propaganda that Jewish history is a history of reaction and slavery, that the spirit of the Jewish tradition is money, that the Jews are responsible for the country's shortages and economic ills.

That young Jew will feel offended for his father, who has no Jewish newspaper to read and no Jewish theater to attend; for his mother, who cannot have matzoh; for his grandfather, who cannot go to the synagogue in peace; for his uncle, who yearns for some news of Israel, and is afraid to seek it. And he will be offended for himself—for he must realize that as his Jewishness is reviled, his humanity is degraded.

So, the wholesale brutal assault on Judaism and Jewishness not only deprives Soviet Jews of their rights—but affronts their self-respect, besmirches their honor, and lowers their dignity among their non-Jewish neighbors.

Thus is an ancient and illustrious community ground down, its spirit and consciousness pulverized.

The objective of this policy is of course to make Jews—as Jews—disappear. This is what I mean by de-Judaization. They are not to be made to disappear as human beings. But they must be forcibly assimilated, by the simple means of depriving them of their cultural and religious rights and institutions. In time, after two or three generations have lived out their lives with not the slightest opportunity to learn or know anything at all about Jewishness—Jewish consciousness and Jewish identity will grow faint and quietly expire.

By then, there will no longer be a Jewish nationality requiring cultural rights; no longer a Jewish religious entity requiring religious rights. There will no longer be a Jewish problem. The Jews will fade softly into the night of full-scale assimilation.

Thus will the unbroken millennial chain of Jewish history be shattered on Soviet soil. Thus will the Soviet Jewish community—heir to a great and ancient civilization, secular and religious, in Yiddish, Hebrew, and Russian—become a dead end of history.

For the time being, the policy of de-Judaization is not succeeding. For the deprivations and discriminations are having the effect of throwing many Jews, especially young Jews, back on themselves.

Like all Jews everywhere—only more so, since it happened to them—they were traumatized by the Nazi devastation, and later by Stalin's anti-Semitic depredations.

Like most Jews everywhere, they were inspired by the creation of the State of Israel. This continuing policy of deprivation and discrimination is having the effect, for many of them, of stiffening their backs.

So, they go to a performance of Yiddish folksongs and dramatic readings—even though they don't know a word of Yiddish.

So, they try to find some matzoh for the Passover—even though they don't really know what Passover is all about.

So, they throng to the synagogues on certain joyous holidays, to sing and dance and just chat with fellow Jews—even though they aren't the least bit religious.

So they resist in response to the oppression.

But, oh what a wrong is being done them. And how long can they continue to resist, with nothing substantial to sustain their religious and cultural growth?

Can it be that this great Jewish community will be no more? Can it be that this rich soil of Jewish vitality is doomed to disappear? Will the world remain silent in the face of this spiritual atrocity? And are we to remain silent?

In the face of the miracle of creative Jewish survival after 2,000 years of dispersion and persecution, it would be a foolish prophet who would dare to predict the spiritual end of Soviet Jewry. But it would be even more foolish and dangerous to rely on miracles.

If there is hope for their future, it lies in their own courageous resistance—and in our determination to do everything we can to bolster their resistance and their spirit.

It is for us here to speak out for reason and justice. We must bring comfort and hope to that last great remnant of East European Jewry. It is a community with a special claim on the conscience of all mankind.

For let us face the historical truth: Neither we, nor the rest of the world did enough to save the Jews of Europe from devastation. We—all of us in the West, Jews, and Gentiles alike—owe a debt of shame.

It is a debt we cannot repay the dead. But their heirs and survivors in the U.S.S.R. bear their claim on the conscience of us all.

We owe it to the dead to save the living now.

We must break through the pall of bland indifference, of polite acquiescence, that prevails about the plight of Soviet Jewry. If it is thought of at all in the world at large, it is only as an afterthought. Governments are not agitated by it: Leaders do not speak up about it. Humanitarian movements do not make of it a rallying cry, as they do of other deserving causes. It has not been made a priority problem at the United Nations, one of the forums where it belongs.

In short, it has not become what it must be—a major item on the agenda of the world's conscience.

In this country it is essential that private and public voices be raised in protest. Within our Government the Senate of the United States has historically been one of the most effective forums for expressing officially the aroused conscience of our country. On sev-

1964

eral occasions during the past 15 years, the Senate has by formal resolution denounced Soviet transgressions against human rights. Now it must meet this solemn responsibility again by condemning religious persecution behind the Iron Curtain.

In September, I introduced Senate Resolution 204 for this purpose. Sixty-three Senators—from all parts of the country and representing different points of view in both political parties—quickly and firmly joined in its sponsorship. They shared my belief that it is time for the Senate to take an official stand on the Soviet Government's systematic policy of Jewish persecution.

The Senate's voice, when raised in official protest, can have powerful impact. The Soviets are stung by vigorous and sustained criticism. The recent protests of individual Senators have already irritated a sensitive Soviet nerve. The recent commutation of a death sentence was a small but significant reaction to a protest that is only now beginning.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, has assured me the hearings will be held on my resolution. I am hopeful they will take place at an early date and be followed by prompt passage of the resolution.

The Soviet Government will feel the force of public opinion aroused in this Nation and throughout the world.

Since Soviet Jews are utterly helpless, defenseless and without voice, we must do for them what they cannot do for themselves:

We must give them voice.

We must rise to their defense.

We must cry out for justice, justice.

We cannot keep silent so long as justice is not done.

We must give the world no surcease—until the world pays attention.

We dare not rest until we have aroused the conscience of humanity.

To the suffering Soviet Jews we must say with a strong, constant, unyielding voice—"We have not forgotten or forsaken you, nor will we ever."

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDENBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT, TO THE AMERICAN JEWS CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY, APRIL 5, 1964

We are gathered in this important conference to consider the question of discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union. The denial of human rights by the Soviet Union to Jews is properly a matter of deep concern to all Americans of every religious persuasion. It is similarly a proper matter of deep concern to all Americans of the Jewish faith that the Soviet Union, while professing in theory to permit the free exercise of religion to all people and groups, in fact and practice is hostile to all religious faiths. The Soviet Union is avowedly a materialistic nation. Its Government is not neutral in religious matters. Its policies and influence are directed against religious beliefs and practices. Therefore, in a conference of this kind we are not and cannot be unmindful of the plight of the great body of people in the Soviet Union whose human right to freedom of religious exercise is substantially curtailed. The discrimination against Jews by the Government of the Soviet Union is an aspect of overall discrimination against all religious groups. It is, however, something more than a manifestation of religious repression by an atheistic state. The evidence is overwhelming that the religious and cultural freedom of Soviet Jewry is more severely limited than any other religious group and that discrimination against Soviet Jews has reached alarming proportions. The tragic experience of mankind with the cancer of anti-Semitism so fresh in the minds of all makes it imperative that those who believe

in the dignity of man and in human rights speak out in vigorous protest.

I want to commend the sponsors of this conference for convening it. The meeting itself is a virtually unprecedented testimonial to the unity of Jewish opinion on this vital and important subject. I hope and trust that you will continue to protest against the virus of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union until no vestige of it remains.

The 2 1/2 to 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union, though classified by the Soviet Constitution and laws as a national group, are deprived of their national culture and the means of expressing it. Every other Soviet nationality is permitted the use of its national language and is granted support for its cultural institutions. But the teaching of Hebrew, the Biblical language, is banned in the Soviet Union; Yiddish, the tongue of 450,000 Soviet citizens, is discouraged; Jewish schools virtually prohibited and non-existent; the once flourishing Yiddish theater scarcely tolerated; and Jewish literature and publications sharply curtailed.

The religious freedom of Soviet Jews is severely limited, more so than any other religious group; increasingly synagogues are closed and private worship restricted; both Bible and prayer books are denied printing; other necessary religious articles are made unavailable; the last kosher butcher shop in Moscow closed down, the ancient Jewish cemetery in Kiev condemned; the state baking of matzoh discontinued, private baking discouraged by prosecutions, the training of seminarians hampered, and religious exchanges discouraged.

Jews are vilified in the Soviet press and other mass media which reflect hostility to the Jewish people as such. This has reached such proportions that western Communist parties which generally slavishly follow the Kremlin line have been moved to protest the publication of a blatantly anti-Semitic book published late last year in Kiev, copies of which have just come to light in this country and in the Western World. This book, "Judaism Without Embellishment," is not just a privately printed tract. It was officially issued by the Ukrainian Academy of Science and had a substantial press run in the Ukrainian language. I have seen this book, and its cartoons are sharply reminiscent of Julius Streicher's "Der Stuermer," that notorious Nazi publication.

I note in today's newspapers that the hierarchy of the ideological commission of the Soviet Communist Party has issued what appears to be a partial repudiation of this book. This is welcome, if somewhat belated, but in itself demonstrates the value of forthright worldwide protest against manifestations of anti-Semitism.

Jewish emigration even for the limited purpose of reuniting families torn asunder by war and Nazi persecution is permitted only on the insignificant scale.

There is increasing evidence of discrimination against Jews in employment and areas of public life.

Finally, there is also evidence that an undue proportion of Jews is being prosecuted and executed for economic crimes.

No law-abiding citizen of any nation and particularly no judge can urge that any person or group is immune from the equal application of any nation's laws. But when 60 percent of those executed in the Soviet Union for economic crimes are Jews who comprise only a little more than 1 percent of its population then the belief naturally is fostered that Jews are receiving unequal treatment under Soviet law. Particularly is this so, in the setting of other discriminations against the Jews both historical and current in old Russia and in the Soviet Union.

Discrimination against Soviet Jews is not

solely an internal matter for the Soviet Union. It is a proper concern for all in this country and elsewhere who believe in human values. Soviet mistreatment of the Jews violates worldwide concept of human rights and human dignity; transgresses the United Nations Charter to which the Soviet Union is a party and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is morally binding upon all member states of the United Nations.

It is not sufficient answer to reply, as Soviet officials are wont to do, that some of my best in-laws are Jewish. Nor is it an answer to assert that those charging discrimination are motivated by hostility to the Soviet people. The philosopher Bertrand Russell is a self-proclaimed friend of the Soviet Union and even he has found it necessary to write profound and serious letters to Mr. Khrushchev expressing deep concern about Soviet treatment of its Jewish citizens in terms similar to those I have expressed this evening. In stating my views, I do so as an American citizen who supports the effort of our Government, with due regard for our own security as a nation, to seek ways for better understanding between our country and the Soviet Union; one who shares with the great majority of our people the desire for an end to the cold war and for a just and lasting peace.

In appealing for an end to governmental discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union, I am mindful that as a Nation our record is not perfect—we all too often fall short of realizing the great ideals of human liberty and equality embodied in our great Declaration of Human Rights. I am also mindful, however, that our Government policy is directed to ending rather than extending discrimination.

But one need never apologize for speaking out for human rights of all peoples everywhere. For as the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights asserts, "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world."

I am one who having read the full text of Rolf Hochhuth's controversial play "The Deputy" and who having lived through those terrible days, believes that the dramatist did not do justice to that great and good Pontiff, Pope Pius XII. Jews are and ever should be grateful for what the Pope and the Catholic Church did to rescue innocent Jewish victims of Nazi insanity and barbarism. But whatever one's views about the play's characterization of the Pope, all men of good will must agree with the ancient Biblical teaching echoed in the play, that we are indeed our brother's keeper and that it is the duty of all men at all times and under all circumstances to speak out against the denial of human rights whenever and wherever such denial occurs. In matters of conscience there can be no missing voices.

SILENT DIPLOMACY WILL NOT SAVE SOVIET JEWS

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

Events over the Passover holiday demonstrate the relentless character of the Soviet Union's campaign of repression against the Jewish minority in the U.S.S.R. But they also show that the regime in the U.S.S.R. is not impervious to the protests of the world on this issue. Both are vitally important conclusions.

That anti-Jewish repression continues was shown when on the eve of the Passover holiday the Kremlin went out of its way to prevent Jews from obtaining matzoth in time by impounding 2,000 10-pound packages of matzoth paid for and sent with full import clearances prepaid by Americans in New

April 6

York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles to relatives and friends in the Soviet Union.

In response to representations by the U.S. Embassy in Moscow made at my request, the Soviets explained that packages from individuals to individuals were delivered and only those sent by organizations were returned; it was also claimed that matzoth were available in the U.S.S.R. to all who wanted them. But this explanation was contradicted by reports in the Soviet press itself before the beginning of the Passover festival on March 27 on the nondelivery of the parcels and the advice of Moscow's Chief Rabbi allowing Jews to use peas and beans in place of matzoth.

It is hard to believe that in this decade, a major world power like the Soviet Union with its nuclear capability and space exploration achievements would stoop to this kind of petty but cruel and repressive official harassment of a helpless minority. Against such calculated disrespect for elementary human rights as well as for world opinion, there must be general and universal protest.

The fact that the Soviet regime listens was shown when the Soviet official news agency Tass reported a partial recantation of the scandalous and libelous anti-Semitic book published in Kiev under the title "Judaism Without Embellishment." It was denounced in even stronger terms by the Ideological Commission of the Communist Party as a result of the uproar created by the book. The Kremlin leaders should be made aware that a great wave of indignation from all parts of the world is rising up over the Soviet Union's continued campaign of anti-Jewish repression.

All of us must here resolve that we will not remain silent or permit the world to remain silent while the scope and intensity of Soviet actions against the Jewish minority grows and becomes more deliberate.

In the name of humanity not only our voices but the voices of free men and women everywhere as well must be raised above the Iron Curtain in protest.

This conference must demand that the Soviet Union halt these oppressive acts forthwith and restore to Jews the elementary human rights to practice their religion, to be free of discrimination, and to rejoin their families in other lands.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is very sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism. The Communists pride themselves on the law which makes anti-Semitism a criminal offense. Indeed, they tried to deny its existence when the poet Yevtushenko published his famous poem "Iabl Yar" as a protest against Russian anti-Semitism. But when 89 out of 163 sentenced to death by Soviet courts between July 1961 and October 1963 for alleged economic crimes—almost 60 percent—are publicly reported to be Jews and their names are held up for ridicule and contempt in the official Soviet press; when the Soviet regime closes down synagogues and Jewish cemeteries, crushes every vestige of Jewish culture and deports Jews to Kazakhstan while simultaneously telling the outside world that Jews enjoy religious freedom; and when there is distributed an officially published edition of 12,000 copies of the blatantly anti-Semitic book by Trofim Kichko, entitled "Judaism Without Embellishment," under the auspices of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences—then it is time to rip off the false mask from the Soviet claim that there is no "Jewish question" under communism and to expose the hypocrisy behind official denials of anti-Jewish actions. The Kremlin would like us to believe that anti-Jewish repressive acts are cold war lies spread by capitalists and imperialists, but the facts give this explanation lie.

I have asked the Soviet authorities to explain why there is such a sharp difference between the way Jews are described in Soviet publications for external distribu-

tion and the way they are vilified and made objects of suspicion in books and periodicals distributed inside the U.S.S.R. The crude racist hatemongering of the Kichko book has brought forth protests even from Communists themselves in France, Italy, and the United States who have condemned its Hitlerite propaganda and called for its suppression.

In the Soviet press for the first time, the Jewish nationality of the accused in the show trials is openly flaunted. This was not done even under Stalin with his "Doctors' Plot" when Jews were identified only through euphemisms like "cosmopolitans," and the shock and significance of this departure from Communist ideological practice has not been lost on Jews. Add to all this the fact that propaganda against Israel has been stepped up, and you can readily appreciate the mounting fears of Jews the world over for the safety of our coreligionists in the U.S.S.R.

Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders from time to time have tried to insist that Soviet treatment of religious minorities is an internal matter and that protests constitute interference in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs. Over a century ago, the U.S. Government provided an answer to this kind of rebuttal, and formulated a policy that remains valid to this day.

Since 1840, the United States while recognizing the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state, nevertheless has protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments and justified these protests in the name of our moral duty toward humanity. The United States has done so alone and also in concert with other nations. Our country has never been silent in the face of persecution.

We have lodged these protests and registered our disapproval in a variety of ways, among them, through direct communication to the governments concerned, by recalling the U.S. diplomatic representative for consultation, by direct references in the President's annual message to the Congress, by the termination of a commercial treaty, and by the use of indirect acts such as joining in multilateral acts of disapproval as a means of protest.

The list of such protests on behalf of Jews is long and honorable. In 1840 the United States condemned the persecution of Jews in Damascus.

In 1870 we urged the Ottoman government to halt the killing of Jews in Rumania.

In 1877 the United States granted protection to Russian Jews settled in or near Jerusalem, and emphasized that "the sympathy of the United States for all oppressed peoples in foreign countries has been freely manifested in all cases where it could be done in accordance with the spirit of international courtesy and diplomatic usage."

In the next two decades the United States protested no fewer than nine times against the czarist Russian Government's repressive acts and persecution of Jews. These protests, backed by the American people and by resolutions of the Congress culminated in 1911 when President Taft terminated the treaty of commerce with Russia which had been in effect since 1832. President Taft took this action over the advice of the State Department which warned that abrogation of the treaty would have serious effects on the Nation's commercial relations with the Russian Empire in addition to larger political considerations.

The United States has protested action against Jews by Rumania, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Italy, and Poland. The record of U.S. protests to the Nazi government should still be fresh in our minds. Secretary Cordell Hull recorded in his memoirs that "I found myself calling in the German Ambassador time after time to protest against vio-

lations of the rights of our citizens, against persecution of the Jews, and against mistreatment of Americans by Nazi bullies."

No policy is more firmly fixed in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs than this moral imperative to come to the aid of oppressed peoples. American public opinion must be roused to the danger that this Soviet campaign presents not only to Jews—though they are the first victims—but to all religious minorities in the U.S.S.R. Moscow has every reason to be concerned over the bad name that its anti-Jewish policy is creating for it in the world, and our protest must be intensified in every way possible. Only then will we be able to convince the Kremlin that the price it must pay for its anti-Jewish policy is too high and too costly in terms of its international image.

This is no time for counsels of caution and fear—or of silence—on the part of American Jewry. Each great wave of indignation will serve to ultimately alleviate, and will help prevent aggravation of the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Each protest by individuals, by organizations, and by the free nations of the world will serve to make the Kremlin realize how sterile and harmful is its anti-Jewish policy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 6, 1964]

HELP FOR SOVIET JEWS IS URGED (By George Eagle)

Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg and Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, said yesterday it is time for the United Nations and U.S. Senate to become officially concerned with the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Justice Goldberg and Ribicoff, in remarks made at the opening session of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, condemned what they term systematic persecution of 3 million Soviet Jews.

The 2-day conference at the Willard Hotel, called by 24 national Jewish organizations representing most of America's 5,685,000 Jews, is intended to focus worldwide attention on the position of Soviet Jews. About 500 delegates are attending.

The participating groups hope to move the Soviet government toward reforms of its policies towards Jews.

Neither Justice Goldberg nor Ribicoff expressed fear that such efforts would hurt United States-Soviet relations.

Justice Goldberg said: "In stating my views, I do so as an American citizen who supports the effort of our Government with due regard for our own security as a Nation, to seek ways for better understanding between our country and the Soviet Union; one who shares with the great majority of our people the desire for an end to the cold war and for a just and lasting peace."

"In appealing for an end to governmental discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union, I am mindful that as a Nation our record is not perfect—we all too often fall short of realizing the great ideals of human liberty and equality embodied in our great declaration of human rights. I am also mindful, however, that our Government policy is directed to ending rather than extending discrimination."

He added that expressions of concern over the condition of Soviet Jews should not be considered meddling in Soviet internal matters.

"Discrimination against Soviet Jews is not solely an internal matter for the Soviet Union. It is a proper concern for all in this country and elsewhere who believe in human values. Soviet mistreatment of the Jews violates human rights and human dignity; transgresses the United Soviet Union as a party, and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is morally bind-

1964

ing upon member States of the United Nations."

RIBICOFF called on the Senate—"historically *** one of the most effective forums for expressing officially the aroused conscience of our country"—to denounce "Soviet transgressions" against Soviet Jews.

He has introduced a Senate resolution for this purpose, and 63 Senators have joined in sponsorship of the measure. He said Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Democrat of Arkansas), "has assured me that hearings will be held on my resolution."

Both Justice Goldberg and RIBICOFF detailed evidence they said pointed to a Soviet attempt to erase Jewish identity. They cited the banning of Hebrew; discouragement of Jewish schools and use of Yiddish; closing of synagogues and kosher butcher shops, and prohibiting the baking of unleavened bread.

Justice Goldberg noted that while slightly more than 1 percent of the Soviet population is Jewish, 60 percent of those executed for economic crimes were Jews.

The conference also heard from Label A. Katz of New Orleans, president of B'nai B'rith, and Rabbi Uri Miller of Baltimore, President of the Synagogue Council of America.

Katz said Premier Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin did not extend to Stalin's anti-Semitism. Katz also said the conference was not concerned with cold war problems: "We do not challenge Mr. Khrushev's view of a world of good goulash and ballet. We simply propose that good goulash tastes better and ballet is more inspiring when the human spirit is free and untrammeled."

Rabbi Miller said, "Discrimination against Russian Jewry is without end, and all of it is aimed at the cultural destruction of the Jewish people."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1964]
GOLDBERG SCORES MOSCOW ON JEWS—JUSTICE, AT PARLEY, CHARGES VIOLATION OF U.N. CHARTER

(By Irving Splegel)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the U.S. Supreme Court accused the Soviet Government tonight of having violated the United Nations Charter in its treatment of the Jewish people and Judaism.

Using strong terms, Justice Goldberg cited what he called extensive deprivations of Jewish cultural and spiritual rights and asserted that this discrimination "is not solely an internal matter for the Soviet Union; it is a proper concern for all in this country and elsewhere who believe in human values."

He charged that Soviet mistreatment of Jews violates world-wide concepts of human rights and dignity, "transgresses the United Nations Charter to which the Soviet Union is a party, and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is morally binding upon all member states of the United Nations."

The remarks keynoted the opening of a 2-day conference at the Willard Hotel, convened by 24 major national Jewish organizations. It is aimed at adopting a long-range program to arouse public opinion in the Nation and the world against what American Jewish leaders term "the deteriorating status of Jews and Judaism in the Soviet Union."

The 500 delegates represent almost every area and viewpoint of Jewish religious and secular life. Their groups embrace the greater majority of the more than 5 million Jews in the United States.

Participants call its representative character the most comprehensive since 1943, when all groups united under the old American Jewish Conference to deal with emergency postwar problems affecting the rescue and rehabilitation of Jewish refugees.

It has been estimated that there are 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union. The meeting's major concern is what is feared to be a Soviet campaign to eradicate Judaism from Soviet life.

A fact sheet, distributed to the delegates, presented a long list of Soviet discriminatory practices. It cited the closing of 396 synagogues in the last 7 years, leaving fewer than 96 open. The publication of prayer books, Bibles, and calendars of Jewish religious holidays is banned. Emigration is forbidden.

The fact sheet said Jews were forbidden to have central religious organizations such as those permitted the Russian Orthodox and Baptist Churches.

It added that no book had been published in Yiddish in 2 years and that the use of Yiddish as a language of instruction was not possible.

Jews are not permitted to teach classes in Jewish history, even in the Russian language, the document charged.

Justice Goldberg spoke of these reported discriminations and made specific mention of the publication of "Judaism Without Embellishment," written by Trofim K. Kichko and published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

The book, replete with anti-Semitic overtones, contains caricatures of Jews. Western Communist parties have protested its publication.

The ideological commission of the Soviet Communist Party denounced the book yesterday. The commission said statements and illustrations in the book "may insult the feelings of believers and be interpreted in a spirit of anti-Semitism."

Justice Goldberg said he welcomed "what appears to be a partial repudiation of this book."

"In appealing for an end of governmental discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union," he continued, "I am mindful that as a nation our record is not perfect—we all too often fall short of realizing the great ideals of human liberty and equality embodied in our great Declaration of Human Rights.

"I am also mindful, however, that our Government policy is directed to ending rather than extending discrimination.

Label A. Katz, president of B'nai B'rith, who presided, said the appeal of the conference was for the "right of the [Soviet] Jew to be Jewish, [his] right to be, not someone else—but to be himself."

Mr. Katz said the conference's purpose was "without political overtones" and "removed from cold war problems."

As delegates gathered, the Soviet Embassy delivered a statement by Soviet Jewish religious and secular leaders protesting the conference.

The statement, addressed to the conference sponsors, asserted that there was no discrimination against Judaism in the Soviet Union and protested "slanderous attack on our Soviet country, which has done so much for the Jewish people."

It was signed by Rabbi Yehuda Leib Levin, Moscow Central Synagogue; Rabbi Natan Olefsky, Marina Roshcha Synagogue, Moscow; Avraam Panich, Kiev Synagogue; Solomon Gerelik, chairman of the Minsk Jewish religious community; Nohem Paller, chairman of community of Moscow's Central Synagogue, and Gershun Lib, chairman of community of Marina Roshcha Synagogue, Moscow.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1964]
SOVIET DENOUNCES BOOK ON JUDAISM—SAYS "ANTI-SEMITISM" TAINTS VOLUME PRINTED IN KIEV

(By Theodore Shabad)

Moscow, April 4.—The Ideological Commission of the Soviet Communist party denounced today in strong terms an antireligious book containing caricatures of Jews.

The statement, adopted at a special meeting and published in Pravda, the Communist party newspaper, said the book, published by Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, contained statements and illustrations that "may insult the feelings of believers and be interpreted in a spirit of anti-Semitism."

The party announcement added that the book "contradicted the party's Leninist policy on religious and nationality questions and merely feeds anti-Soviet insinuations of our ideological foes, who are trying at all costs to create a so-called Jewish question."

The unusual condemnation by the party's ideological watchdog body, headed by Leonid I. Il'yichev, appeared less than 2 weeks after Communist parties in other countries had attacked the book and demanded that it be withdrawn from circulation.

IZVESTIA SEES UNDUE "FUSS"

Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, while criticizing some aspects of the book, played down the significance of its publication and described the uproar abroad as an "incomprehensible fuss." It was evident, however, that the party's ideological commission had considered the matter to be serious enough to convene a special meeting.

The 193-page paperback volume, written by Trofim K. Kichko, was published in Kiev last year under the title "Judaism Without Embellishment."

In addition to the usual antireligious propaganda found in Soviet books on atheism, it contains cartoons of beak-nosed men squabbling about money and collaborating with Nazis. Several passages in the text dealing with Jewish participation in black-marketing and other economic crimes have clearly anti-Semitic overtones.

The book was attacked by the Communist parties in the United States, Britain and France. The Soviet Union's first reaction to this was the publication of critical statements on the book through Tass, the official press agency, and Novosti, a feature syndicate.

"No matter what they [Jews] do, selling matzohs or parts of the Torah [religious literature], carrying out rites of burial, circumcision, wedding or divorce, they think above all of money and they despise productive work," one passage asserts.

A cartoon on the cover shows a man in a prayer shawl lurking behind lighted candles and holding out a big hand filled with gold coins. Another depicts a brawl among hook-nosed men and carries the caption: "Money-grabbing servants of the synagogue often have brawls when they divide the profits."

Several cartoons are directed against Israel. In one, former Premier David Ben-Gurion crosses out the words "Do not" in the Ten Commandments to make them read "steal," "kill," "lie."

Pravda indicated that after the furor caused by the book abroad, the ideological commission was specially convened to review the entire question of antireligious literature.

Only last December the commission met to adopt a program for an intensified struggle against religion. A decree made public in March conceded that substantial sectors of the Soviet population remained believers.

USE OF FACT URGED

Antireligious propagandists have been urged to use tact in their campaign and to take care not to antagonize believers.

The Kichko book appeared after new publishing committees had been established throughout the Soviet Union to insure that newspapers, magazines and books conformed more closely to the party's ideological requirements. The committees are expected to examine every piece of printed material before publication.

The Novosti press agency, in its comments on the book, said that Mr. Kichko was "neither a spokesman for the Soviet Government

April 6

nor an exponent of its views and that his pamphlet "cannot be taken as a basis for evaluating the policy of the Soviet Union toward Jews and toward Israel."

The ideological statement in Pravda reiterated official assertions that Jews in the Soviet Union "are all respected in the same situation as other people."

Actually, Jews, being scattered throughout the country, do not have the same opportunities for cultural development, including schools, books, and theaters in their own language, as do other nationalities living in compact areas.

PRAYER IN SENATE TOMORROW TO BE OFFERED BY CARDINAL FRANZ KOENIG, OF AUSTRIA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, do Senators wish me to yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for an announcement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield under the arrangement previously made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is an unusual announcement, but I know that many of our colleagues will appreciate the notice that, tomorrow morning when we convene, the prayer in the Senate will be offered by Cardinal Franz Koenig, of Austria, who is visiting in our country.

Cardinal Koenig is one of the great spiritual leaders of our time; as a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, he has been a moving and thought-provoking leader in the Ecumenical Council and has been closely identified with the so-called progressive or liberal school in his faith's deliberations.

His spiritual domain stretches along the Iron Curtain and its location has given him an opportunity to use his many talents to halt the Communist thrusts in Central and Western Europe and to alleviate the burden and hardships of many refugees. He was particularly active in the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, when his Caritas organization took a leading role in looking after the Hungarian refugees. He worked there, incidentally, with our distinguished colleague the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. As Senators may recall, the Senator from Rhode Island was later awarded the Caritas medal.

Cardinal Koenig is a man of broad intellectual attainments. His presence will be a high honor to the Senate and all of us.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

FEPC—POLICE-STATE METHODS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, several of the highly objectionable provisions of the pending so-called civil rights bill present issues which have long been discussed and upon which the country has long been seriously divided.

As a member of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles in 1960, I well recall the strong-arm methods which were used in the committee in the drafting of the civil rights plank of the Democratic platform which was adopted on July 12, 1960.

Many of the provisions in that civil rights plank of the platform were generally supported by all or practically all members of the platform committee. Without going into these fields of agreement, I note that one provision of the platform is:

We will support whatever action is necessary to eliminate * * * the payment of poll taxes as requirements for voting.

It is well known to every Senator that the Senator from Florida, continuing an activity which he had begun in 1949, and had pursued in every succeeding Congress since that time, introduced again in 1961 a proposed constitutional amendment which he regarded as the action which was necessary to eliminate the payment of poll taxes as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. The Senator from Florida was joined by a large number of his Democratic colleagues and likewise by a large number of his Republican colleagues in offering that proposed amendment which was submitted by the Congress to the States in 1962 and has become the 24th amendment to the Federal Constitution.

While the public well knows that this part of the civil rights plank is one of the items which has received positive action since that time, there are also other provisions which have been accomplished and which have had general approval, and which had the general approval of members of the platform committee.

There were, however, several provisions in that civil rights plank of the platform adopted at Los Angeles in 1960 which were highly controversial and which, both within the platform committee and on the floor of the convention itself, drew the strong opposition of many delegates, largely from the South, but including also some delegates from other parts of the Nation. For the record at this time, I mention three provisions in that platform which were most offensive to the South and to others, and which were strongly opposed both in the platform committee and on the floor of the convention.

These controversial provisions deal, first, with compulsory integration of public schools; second, with the so-called part III provisions of an earlier law empowering the Attorney General to use civil injunction suits in Federal Courts to prevent the denial of any civil rights; and third, with the commitment to support the Federal setting up of a Fair Employment Practices Commission. I quote these provisions of said platform as follows:

A new Democratic administration will also use its full powers—legal and moral—to insure the beginning of good-faith compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public education.

We believe that every school district affected by the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision should submit a plan providing for at least first-step compliance by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

For this and for the protection of all other constitutional rights of Americans, the Attorney General should be empowered and directed to file civil injunction suits in Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color.

That being the so-called part III of the earlier legislation which had been so hotly contested on the floor of the Senate.

The new Democratic administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission to secure effectively for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment.

Those were the highly controversial portions of the civil rights plank of the platform adopted at Los Angeles in 1960 at the Democratic convention.

At the time of consideration and adoption of the platform, the strong opposition of southern delegates to these and other portions of the civil rights plank of the platform was voiced by ranking public officials and other delegates assigned by the southern Governors, Senators, Representatives, and party officials to present the southern objections.

I had the honor and responsibility of serving as one of the six southerners who presented our strong objections on the floor of the convention that night in Los Angeles. I believe it would be useful at this time to read into the record a transcript of my remarks at that time, which at one point were greeted by loud boos of some members of the convention and some thousands of spectators who sat in the galleries. My statement at that time was as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats of this convention. This, whether you know it or not, is a serious moment in the life of America and in the life of the Democratic Party. The people who have spoken to you in the last 30 minutes are men who, as Governors of their States, or Supreme Court Judges, or U.S. Senators, have been elected time after time because their people believed that they would carry honestly and keep the faith. Mr. Chairman, I want every Democrat here to realize that nothing has caused this group of men to come before you so much as the effort to make it clear to you that what you are doing is, in our judgment, making it practically impossible to carry 10 States of the Southland in the election of November and it is only that fact, Mr. Chairman, which makes us come here to issue this caution as lifelong Democrats.

Mr. Chairman, this program is written around the sentiments "The Rights of Man." Too bad it is—that in pursuance of such a lofty objective this platform contains elements written by those who believe that the Federal Government can do everything and that anything done by the Federal Government is right no matter how it affects man.

Let's look at this civil rights platform just a few minutes—the FEPC provision. I want you Democrats from this Nation to know that FEPC in the Southland is a term that is